



Implementation Drivers: Assessing Best Practices

**National Implementation Science Network (NIRN)
2013**

**Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA CHAPEL HILL**

Citation and Copyright

This document is based on the work of the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN).

© 2013 Dean Fixsen, Karen Blase, Sandra Naoom and Michelle Duda



This content is licensed under Creative Commons license CC BY-NC-ND, Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs . You are free to share, copy, distribute and transmit the work under the following conditions: Attribution — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work); Noncommercial — You may not use this work for commercial purposes; No Derivative Works — You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work. Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

We ask that you let us know how you use these items so we can use your experience and data to improve and expand the survey. Please respond to Dean Fixsen (contact information below). Thank you.

Dean L. Fixsen, Ph.D.
Senior Scientist
FPG Child Development Institute
CB 8040
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-8040
email: nirn@unc.edu

About

The mission of the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) is to contribute to the best practices and science of implementation, organization change, and system reinvention to improve outcomes across the spectrum of human services.

email: nirn@unc.edu
web: <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu>



Implementation Drivers are the key components of capacity and the functional infrastructure supports that enable a program's success. The three categories of Implementation Drivers are Competency, Organization, and Leadership.

Background (Why?)

With the identification of theoretical frameworks resulting from a synthesis of the implementation evaluation literature, there has been a need for measures of the implementation components to assess implementation progress and to test the hypothesized relationships among the components. Reliable and valid measures of implementation components are essential to planning effective implementation supports, assessing progress toward implementation capacity, and conducting rigorous research on implementation. Policy, practice, and science related to implementation can be advanced more rapidly with practical ways to assess implementation.

Since the beginnings of the field, the difficulties inherent in implementation have "discouraged detailed study of the process of implementation. The problems of implementation are overwhelmingly complex and scholars have frequently been deterred by methodological considerations. ... a comprehensive analysis of implementation requires that attention be given to multiple actions over an extended period of time" (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975, p. 450 - 451; see a similar discussion nearly three decades later by Greenhalgh, Robert, MacFarlane, Bate, & Kyriakidou, 2004). Adding to this complexity is the need to simultaneously and practically measure a variety of variables over time, especially when the implementation variables under consideration are not well researched. Recent reviews of the field (Ellis, Robinson, Ciliska, Armour, Raina, Brouwers, et al., 2003; Greenhalgh et al., 2004) have concluded that the wide variation in methodology, measures, and use of terminology across studies limits interpretation and prevents meta-analyses with regard to dissemination-diffusion and implementation studies.

Recent attempts to analyze components of implementation have used 1) very general measures (e.g. Landenberger & Lipsey, 2005; Mihalic & Irwin, 2003) that do not specifically address core implementation components, 2) measures specific to a given innovation (e.g. Olds, Hill, O'Brien, Racine, & Moritz, 2003; Schoenwald, Sheidow, & Letourneau, 2004) that may lack generality across programs, or 3) measures that only indirectly assess the influences of some of the core implementation components (e.g. Klein, Conn, Smith, Speer, & Sorra, 2001; Panzano, et al., 2004).


The following assessments are specific to “best practices” extracted from: 1) the literature, 2) interactions with purveyors who are successfully implementing evidence-based programs on a national scale, 3) in-depth interviews with 64 evidence-based program developers, 4) meta-analyses of the literature on leadership, and 5) analyses of leadership in education (Blase, Fixsen, Naoom, & Wallace, 2005; Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005; Heifetz & Laurie, 1997; Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008; Naoom, Blase, Fixsen, Van Dyke, & Bailey, 2010; Rhim, Kowal, Hassel, & Hassel, 2007).

For more information on the active frameworks for Implementation Drivers and Implementation Stages derived by the National Implementation Research Network, go to <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu>.

Definitions

There are 3 categories of Implementation Drivers:

- 1) **Competency Drivers** – are mechanisms to develop, improve and sustain one’s ability to implement an intervention as intended in order to benefit children, families and communities.
- 2) **Organization Drivers** – are mechanisms to create and sustain hospitable organizational and system environments for effective services.
- 3) **Leadership Driver** – focuses on providing the right leadership strategies for the types of leadership challenges. These leadership challenges often emerge as part of the change management process needed to make decisions, provide guidance, and support organization functioning.



Scoring Key

In Place	Item is part of the system and “evidence” of this component are observable and/or measurable
Partially in Place	Part of the component has been established, the component has been conceptualized but not fully used, or the component exists, but is not being utilized on a regular basis
Not in Place	The component does not exist or has not yet been initiated
Don’t Know	Use this category if the information is not known. It is recommended that an action plan item is generated to gather this information or identify individuals who should be part of the assessment team. This item is not scored, nor part of the denominator when calculating scores.
Don’t Understand	Use this if the item is not understood. Contact nirn@unc.edu for item explanation. This item is not scored, nor part of the denominator when calculating scores.
Notes	This section can be used to note ideas generate for action planning or follow up

Introduction and Purpose (“What”)

The Implementation Drivers are processes that can be leveraged to improve competence and to create a more hospitable organizational and systems environment for an evidence-based program or practice (Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005). Since sound and effective implementation requires change at practice, organization, and State and Federal levels, implementation supports must be purposeful to create change in the knowledge, behavior, and attitudes of all the human service professionals and partners involved.

The Implementation Drivers are reviewed here in terms of accountability and “best practices” to improve and achieve competence and confidence of the persons who will be involved in implementing the new way of work (e.g. practitioners, supervisors, coaches, managers, directors, etc.) and the organizations and systems that will support the new ways of work. The Assessment asks respondents to rate the implementation supports that are in place currently, based on their own experiences.

Overall, the Drivers are viewed through an Implementation Lens. After all, most organizations would say that they already recruit and select staff, provide orientation and some training, supervise their staff, etc. But what do these activities look like when they are focused on *Effective Implementation Practices* designed to create practice, organizational, and systems change at all levels? The items help to operationalize best practices for each Driver.

The Implementation Team using the Assessment items also will want to discuss the importance and perceived cost-benefit of fully utilizing the best practices related to each Driver as well as the degree to which the Team has “control” over each Driver and the associated best practices. When the best practices cannot be adhered to, then the Team needs to be confident that weaknesses in one Driver are being *compensated for* by robust application of other Drivers. For example, if skill-based training is needed but is not offered with qualified behavior rehearsal leaders who know the intervention well, then coaches will have increased responsibility to develop the basic skills of the persons they are coaching.

Instructions

Pre-requisite

A pre-requisite for effective use of the Implementation Drivers is a well operationalized intervention (program, practice, or innovation). The more clearly the core intervention components are defined and validated through research (e.g. performance assessment correlated with outcomes; dosage and outcome data), the more clearly the Implementation Drivers can be focused on bringing these core intervention components “to life” and sustaining and improving them in the context of practices, organizations, and systems.

Facilitator and Participants (“Who”)

It is recommended that an individual with expertise in Active Implementation Frameworks facilitates the completion of this assessment. Over time, agencies and organizations using this assessment will gain the expertise to facilitate this process internally, but an outside facilitator with the necessary experience and skills is recommended for agencies using the assessment for the first time.

Assessment participants should include Implementation Team members who have a role in developing, monitoring, and improving implementation drivers. It recommended that practitioners do not participate in the completion of the assessment. Only those individuals with responsibility for overseeing aspects of implementation drivers should complete the assessment.

Facilitation and Use of this Measure (“HOW”)

The assessment should be completed through expert facilitation with a group of implementation team members. The assessment was not developed as a self-assessment. Facilitators should build consensus scores for each best practice for each implementation driver. Consensus scores will lend themselves to subsequent action planning which is the purpose of this assessment.

Stage-Based Implementation Assessments (“When”)

STEP 1: This assessment can be used at all stages of implementation of an innovation. Before beginning the assessment, the assessor must first determine the stage of implementation for the innovation in an organization. There are no fixed rules to follow, so assessors must use their good judgment. However, the following is some guidance we have developed to help you determine the stage of implementation.

Given the description provided of the innovation, where are they with respect to stage of implementation? (The following are descriptions of activities that characterize each of the stages of implementation).

- **Exploration** – Assess readiness for change and considers adopting evidence-based programs and practices, examines the fit of various programs to the needs of the target population, assesses feasibility, and looks at T/TA needs and resources.
- **Installation**- Assure the availability of resources necessary to initiate the project, such as staffing, space, equipment, organizational supports, and new operating policies and procedures.
- **Initial Implementation**- Organization learns the new ways of work, learns from mistakes, and continues the effort to achieve buy-in by those who will need to implement the project components. This stage is characterized by frequent problem-solving at the practice and program levels.
- **Full Implementation**- Assure components are integrated into the organization and are functioning effectively to achieve desired outcomes. Staff has become skillful in their service

delivery, new processes and procedures have become routine, and the new program or practice is fully integrated into the organization.

STEP 2: Once you've determined the stage of implementation, the frame you use to complete the drivers assessment will be as follows:

- For Exploration, you ASK: How are we planning for...?
- For Installation you ASK: How are we installing...?
- For Initial Implementation you ASK: How are we supporting...?
- For Full Implementation you ASK: How are we improving and sustaining...?

Implementation Drivers: Assessing Best Practices

Today's Date: _____

Facilitator (s): _____

Individuals Participating in the Assessment:

Evidence-based program or practice/evidence-based Innovation being assessed:

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Recruitment and Selection of Staff

Staff selection is the beginning point for building a competent workforce that has the knowledge, skills, and abilities to carry out evidence-based practices with benefits to consumers. Beyond academic qualifications or experience factors, what essential skills are required? Certain practitioner characteristics critical to the use of an evidence-based program are difficult to teach in training sessions so must be part of the selection criteria (e.g. basic professional skills, basic social skills, common sense, empathy, good judgment, knowledge of the field, personal ethics, sense of social justice, willingness to intervene, willingness to learn).

Implementation of effective programs on a useful scale requires:

- Specification of required skills and abilities within the pool of candidates,
- Methods for recruiting likely candidates that possess these skills and abilities,
- Protocols for interviewing candidates, and
- Criteria for selecting practitioners with those skills and abilities.

Even when implementation is occurring in an organization with a well-established staff group, the new way of work can be described and volunteers can be recruited and interviewed to select the first practitioners to make use of an evidence-based intervention or other innovation. The pre-post test scores for training provide an immediate source of selection outcome data, and performance assessment scores provide a more important but longer-term source of feedback on the usefulness of the selection process.

Organizations make use of these data to continue to improve recruitment and selection methods.

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Recruitment and Selection of Staff						
To what extent are best practices being used?	In Place	Partially In Place	Not In Place	Don't Know	Don't Understand	Notes
1. <u>Accountability</u> for development and monitoring of quality and timeliness of selection services <u>is clear</u> (e.g. lead person designated and supported)						
2. <u>Job description</u> clarity re: accountability and expectations						
3. <u>Pre-Requisites</u> for employment are <u>related to "new practices"</u> and expectations (e.g. basic group management skills)						
4. Interactive Interview Process						
Behavioral vignettes and Behavior Rehearsals						
Assessment of <u>ability to accept feedback</u>						
Assessment of <u>ability to change own behavior</u>						
5. <u>Interviewers</u> who understand the skills and abilities needed and can <u>assess applicants accurately</u> .						
6. <u>A regular process is in place to feed forward</u> -interview data to training staff & administrators & coaches (integration)						
7. <u>A regular process is in place to feedback</u> from exit interviews, training data, turnover data, opinions of administrators & coaches, and staff evaluation data to <u>evaluate effectiveness of this Driver</u>						
Best Practice Scores - Percent of Recruitment and Selection Items in each column (Total Items: 9). Note: "Don't know" and "Do Not Understand" are not scored, nor part of the denominator when calculating scores.						

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Training

Staff training is important because evidence-based programs and other innovations represent new ways of providing treatment and support. Innovation-based training helps practitioners (and others) in an organization learn when, where, how, and with whom to use (and not to use) new approaches and new skills. Staff training is an efficient way to:

- Provide knowledge related to the history, theory, philosophy, and values of the program,
- Introduce the components and rationales of key practices, and
- Provide opportunities to practice new skills to criterion and receive feedback in a safe and supportive training environment.

Implementation best practices and science indicate that good training includes ample opportunities for demonstrations of evidence-based practice-related skills, behavior rehearsal to criterion, and pre-post tests of knowledge and skill. The results of post-tests of training are “fed-forward” to the coach for each newly trained practitioner. In this way the coach will know areas of strength and areas that need improvement on which to focus early in the coaching relationship. Organizations make use of these data to continue to improve training methods.

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Training						
To what extent are best practices being used?	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially In Place</i>	<i>Not In Place</i>	Don't Know	Don't Understand	Notes
1. <u>Accountability</u> for development and monitoring of quality and timeliness of training services <u>is clear</u> (e.g. lead person designated and supported)						
2. <u>Timely</u> (criteria: Training occurs <u>before</u> the person attempts to or is required to use the new program or practice)						
3. Skill-based						
<u>Behavior Rehearsals</u>						
<u>Qualified</u> Rehearsal Leaders who are <u>Content</u> Experts						
<u>Practice</u> critical interactions skills <u>to feel confident and competent</u>						
4. <u>Trainers</u> have been <u>trained and coached</u>						
5. Outcome data collected and analyzed (pre and post testing) of knowledge and/or skills						
6. <u>Performance assessment measures</u> collected and analyzed <u>related to training</u> (e.g. schedule, content, processes, qualification of trainers)						
7. Feed Forward of pre/post data to Coaches/ Supervisors						
8. Feedback of pre/post data to Selection and Recruitment						
Best Practice Scores - Percent of Training Items in each column (Total Items: 10). Note: "Don't know" and "Do Not Understand" are not scored, nor part of the denominator when calculating scores.						

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Coaching

Staff Coaching is essential because most skills needed by successful practitioners can be assessed during selection and introduced in training but really are learned on the job with the help of a coach. An effective coach provides “craft” information along with advice, encouragement, and opportunities to practice and use skills specific to the innovation (e.g. engagement, treatment, clinical judgment). The full and effective use of human service innovations requires behavior change at the practitioner, supervisory, and administrative support levels. Training and coaching are the principal implementation methods in which behavior change is brought about for carefully selected staff in the beginning stages of implementation and throughout the life of evidence-based practices and programs and other innovations. Organizations make use of data to continue to improve coaching methods.

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Coaching						
To what extent are best practices being used?	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially In Place</i>	<i>Not In Place</i>	<i>Don't Know</i>	<i>Don't Understand</i>	Notes
1. <u>Accountability for development and monitoring of quality and timeliness of coaching services is clear</u> (e.g. there is a lead person who is accountable for assuring coaching is occurring as planned)						
2. Coaches are <u>fluent</u> in the <u>innovation(s)</u>						
3. There is a <u>written Coaching Service Delivery Plan</u> (where, when, with whom, why)						
4. Coaches use <u>multiple sources of information</u> for feedback to practitioners						
Coaches <u>directly observe practitioners using the innovations(s)</u> (in person, audio, video)						
Coaches <u>review records</u> to obtain information to inform coaching						
Coaching <u>information</u> is obtained from <u>interviews</u> with others associated with the practitioner						
5. Accountability structure and processes for Coaches						
<u>Adherence</u> to Coaching Service Delivery Plan is <u>regularly reviewed</u>						
Evidence that <u>practitioners' abilities</u> to deliver the intervention routinely <u>improve as a result of coaching</u>						

Implementation Drivers: Assessing Best Practices

Multiple sources of <u>information used</u> for feedback to coaches						
a. <u>Satisfaction surveys</u> from those being coached						
b. <u>Observations</u> of each coach by an expert/master coach						
c. <u>Performance (fidelity) Assessments</u> of those being coached are <u>recorded for each coach</u>						
6. Coaching <u>data are reviewed</u> and inform <u>improvements of other Drivers</u> (feedback function)						
<i>Best Practice Scores - Percent of Supervision/Coaching Items in each column (Total Items: 13). Note: "Don't know" and "Do Not Understand" are not scored, nor part of the denominator when calculating scores.</i>						

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Performance Assessment (Fidelity)

Staff Performance Assessment is designed to assess the use and outcomes of the skills that are reflected in the selection criteria, taught in training, and reinforced and expanded in coaching processes. Assessments of practitioner performance (sometimes called measures of fidelity) also provide feedback useful to key implementation staff (interviewers, trainers, coaches, program managers) regarding the progress of implementation efforts and the usefulness of selection, training, and coaching methods. For example, organizations consistently monitor current performance assessments in search of common strengths and areas that need improvement to make adjustments in how selection, training, and coaching are conducted to help strengthen skills related to that area. The organization remains accountable for assuring that current and future practitioners will achieve high levels of effective performance when working with children, families, and others. Organizations make use of data to continue to improve Performance Assessment methods.

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Performance Assessment						
To what extent are best practices being used?	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially In Place</i>	<i>Not In Place</i>	<i>Don't Know</i>	<i>Don't Understand</i>	Notes
1. <u>Accountability</u> for performance assessment measurement and reporting system <u>is clear</u> (e.g. a lead person is designated and supported)						
2. Transparent Processes – <u>Proactive staff orientation</u> to the process and procedures used for performance assessment.						
3. Performance assessment measures are <u>highly correlated</u> with (predictive of) intended outcomes.						
4. Performance assessments are <u>conducted on a regular basis</u> for each practitioner.						
5. The organization has a practical and efficient performance assessment measurement and reporting system						
6. Performance assessment measures extend beyond the measurement of context and content to <u>competence</u> (e.g. competency requires observation).						
7. Use of <u>multiple data sources</u> (e.g. practitioners, supervisors, consumers).						
8. Positive <u>recognition</u> processes in place <u>for participation</u> (e.g. performance assessment is seen as a source of data to improve quality; not a punitive process).						
9. Performance assessments of practitioners are used to assess the effectiveness of coaching.						
Best Practice Scores - Percent of Performance Assessment Items in each column (Total Items: 9). Note: "Don't know" and "Do Not Understand" are not scored, nor part of the denominator when calculating scores.						

ORGANIZATION DRIVER - Decision Support Data Systems

Decision Support Data Systems are sources of information used to help staff members make good decisions internal to an organization. Organizations make use of a variety of measures to:

- assess key aspects of the overall performance of the organization,
- provide data to support decision making, and
- assure continuing implementation of the evidence-based intervention and benefits to children and families over time.

At a minimum, all modern organizations have a financial data collection and reporting system that regularly is monitored internally and externally (e.g. through employment of professional financial managers and clerks in the organization, careful attention from the governing board, and annual audits by external experts). Many organizations also have data collection and reporting systems for their treatment and management processes and outcomes.

Decision support data systems are an important part of continuous quality improvement for interventions, implementation supports, and organization functioning (e.g. used as the “study” part of the never-ending plan-do-study-act cycle). Organizations establish and evolve their data systems so information is immediately accessible and useful to practitioners, trainers, coaches, and managers for short-term and long-term planning and improvement at clinical and organizational levels. If the feedback loops (staff performance evaluations and decision support data systems) indicate needed changes, then the organization adjusts aspects of the system to improve effectiveness and efficiency.

ORGANIZATION DRIVER - Decision Support Data Systems						
To what extent are best practices being used?	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially In Place</i>	<i>Not In Place</i>	Don't Know	Don't Understand	Notes
1. <u>Accountability</u> for measurement and reporting system is <u>clear</u> (e.g. lead person designated and supported)						
2. Includes data related to <u>intermediate and longer-term</u> desired outcomes						
3. Includes <u>data on performance (fidelity) assessment</u> results for each practitioner						
4. Measures are " <u>socially important</u> " (e.g. health and human service achievement, reduction in substance abuse)						
5. Data are:						
<u>Reliable</u> (standardized protocols, trained data gatherers)						
<u>Reported frequently</u> (e.g. weekly, quarterly)						
<u>Built into</u> practice routines						
<u>Widely shared</u> with organization personnel						
Shared with <u>family members and community stakeholders</u>						
<u>Used to make decisions</u> (e.g. training needed, coaching improvements)						
Best Practice Scores - Percent of Decision Support Data System Items in each column (Total Items: 10). Note: "Don't know" and "Do Not Understand" are not scored, nor part of the denominator when calculating scores.						

ORGANIZATION DRIVER - Facilitative Administrative Supports

Facilitative administration provides leadership and makes use of a range of data inputs to inform decision-making, support the overall intervention and implementation processes, and keep staff organized and focused on the desired intervention outcomes. In an organization with facilitative administrators, careful attention is given to policies, procedures, structures, culture, and climate to assure alignment of these aspects of an organization with the needs of practitioners.

Practitioners' interactions with children and families are the keys to any successful intervention. Facilitative administrators and others make full use of available resources to assure that practitioners have the time, skills, and supports they need to perform at a high level of effectiveness with every child and family even as practitioners, coaches, managers, and others come and go year after year. With implementation supports from training, coaching, and technical assistance, administrators continue to use available data and experience to find more and better ways to support practitioners.

ORGANIZATION DRIVER - Facilitative Administrative Supports						
To what extent are best practices being used?	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially In Place</i>	<i>Not In Place</i>	Don't Know	Don't Understand	Notes
1. A Leadership and Implementation Team is formed						
2. The Leadership and Implementation Team has Terms of Reference that include communication protocols to provide feedback to the next level "up" and describes from whom feedback is received (Practice-policy communication protocol)						
3. Policies and procedures are developed and revised to support the new ways of work						
4. The Team uses feedback and data to improve Implementation Drivers						
Solicits and analyzes feedback from staff						
Solicits and analyzes feedback from "stakeholders"						
Reduces internal administrative barriers to quality service and high performance assessment implementation						
Best Practice Scores - Percent of Facilitative Administration Items in each column (Total Items: 7). Note: "Don't know" and "Do Not Understand" are not scored, nor part of the denominator when calculating scores.						

ORGANIZATION DRIVER - Systems Intervention

Systems interventions are strategies for leaders and staff within an organization to work with external systems to ensure the availability of the financial, organizational, and human resources required to support the work of the practitioners. Alignment of these external systems to specifically support the work of practitioners is an important aspect of systems interventions. System interventions take on issues that impact the ability to provide effective services within organizations. System interventions are designed to help create a generally supportive context in which effective services can be provided, maintained, and improved over the years.

ORGANIZATION DRIVER - Systems Intervention					
To what extent are best practices being used?	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially In Place</i>	<i>Not In Place</i>	Don't Know	Notes
1. Leadership intervenes when needed to resolve system issues the effectiveness of work in the organization (e.g. Directors meet with State leaders on issues at that level)					
2. Leadership engages and nurtures multiple “champions” and “opinion leaders” outside the organization					
3. Leadership objectively documents barriers and reports barriers to next level “up”					
4. Leadership makes constructive recommendations to next level “up” to resolve barriers					
5. Leadership develops formal processes to establish and use Practice-Policy Communication Protocols (e.g. linking communication protocols to give and receive feedback from the practice level of the organization)					
6. Leadership creates time-limited, barrier busting capacity by:					
Using Transformation Zones (build capacity and resolve issues in a manageable slice of the system)					
Doing usability testing (short plan-do-study-act cycles with small groups)					
7. Leadership creates optimism and hope by regularly communicating successes					
Best Practice Scores - <i>Percent of Systems Intervention Items in each column (Total Items: 8). Note: "Don't know" and "Do Not Understand" are not scored, nor part of the denominator when calculating scores.</i>					

LEADERSHIP DRIVER

The critical role of leadership at organization and system levels is widely acknowledged. Recent studies have found that “leadership” is not a person but different people engaging in different kinds of leadership behavior as needed to establish effective programs and sustain them as circumstances change over time. For example, leadership needs change as implementation progresses: “adaptive leadership” styles are needed to “champion change” in the beginning; more technical leadership styles are needed to manage the continuing implementation supports (e.g. selection interviews, performance assessments, system interventions) for effective programs over the long run. In the midst of continual social and economic changes that impact human services, the need for adaptive leadership never goes away. Sometimes the same people provide both kinds of leadership. In other cases, leadership responsibilities are more widely distributed within organizations.

LEADERSHIP DRIVER					
Do you agree that best practices are being used?	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Technical Leadership					
1. Leaders within the organization have provided specific guidance on technical issues where there was sufficient clarity about what needed to be done.					
2. Leaders within the organization have been very good at giving reasons for changes in policies, procedures, or staffing.					
3. Leaders within the organization have been actively engaged in resolving any and all issues that got in the way of using the innovation effectively.					
4. Leaders within the organization have been very good at focusing on the issues that really matter at the practice level.					
5. Leaders within the organization have been fair, respectful, considerate, and inclusive in their dealings with others.					
Adaptive Leadership					
1. Leaders within the organization continually have looked for ways to align practices with the overall mission, values, and philosophy of the organization.					
2. Leaders within the organization have convened groups and worked to build consensus when faced with issues on which there was little agreement about how to proceed.					
3. Leaders within the organization have established clear and frequent communication channels to provide information to practitioners and to hear about their successes and concerns.					
4. Leaders within the organization have actively and routinely sought feedback from practitioners and others regarding					

Implementation Drivers: Assessing Best Practices

supports for effective use of the innovation.					
5. Leaders within the organization have been actively involved in:					
Conducting employment interviews.					
Participating in practitioner training.					
Conducting performance assessments of individual practitioners.					
Creating more and better organization-level assessments to inform decision making.					
Best Practice Scores - Percent of Leadership Items in each column (Total Items: 8).					

Drivers Best Practices Action Plan

Please use this section to identify action items based on the information and data generated from the Implementation Drivers Assessment.

Date Implementation Drivers: Assessing Best Practices Measure Completed: _____

Total Best Practices Score Summary:	In Place	Partially In Place	Not In Place
Number of Items Marked in each column (out of a total of 74 potential items)			
Percent of Items Across Eight Implementation Drivers for each column (ie. $[X \text{ items}/74] \times 100\%$)			

Summary of “next right steps” by Driver	Individual (s) Responsible	Date Due	Priority Level
Selection:			
Training:			
Coaching:			
Performance Assessment (Fidelity):			
Decision Support Data Systems:			
Facilitative Administrative Supports:			
Systems Intervention:			
Leadership:			

References

- Blase, K. A., Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Operationalizing implementation: Strategies and methods*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute. <http://nirn.fmhi.usf.edu/resources/detail.cfm?resourceID=48>
- Ellis, P., Robinson, P., Ciliska, D., Armour, T., Raina, P., Brouwers, M., et al. (2003). *Diffusion and Dissemination of Evidence-Based Cancer Control Interventions*. (No. Evidence Report /Technology Assessment Number 79. (Prepared by Oregon Health and Science University under Contract No. 290-97-0017.) AHRQ Publication No. 03-E033. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
- Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation Research: A synthesis of the literature*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231). <http://nirn.fmhi.usf.edu/resources/detail.cfm?resourceID=31>
- Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., MacFarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: Systematic review and recommendations. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 82(4), 581-629.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Laurie, D. L. (1997). The work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(1), 124-134.
- Kaiser, R. B., Hogan, R., & Craig, S. B. (2008). Leadership and the fate of organizations. *American Psychologist*, 63(2), 96-110.
- Klein, K. J., & Sorra, J. S. (1996). The challenge of innovation implementation. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 1055-1080.
- Klein, K. J., Conn, B., Smith, A., Speer, D. B., & Sorra, J. (2001). Implementing computerized technology: An organizational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 811-824.
- Landenberger, N. A., & Lipsey, M. W. (2005). The Positive Effects of Cognitive-Behavioral Programs for Offenders: A Meta-Analysis of Factors Associated with Effective Treatment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1(4), 451-476.
- Mihalic, S., & Irwin, K. (2003). Blueprints for Violence Prevention: From Research to Real-World Settings-Factors Influencing the Successful Replication of Model Programs. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 1(4), 307-329.

- Naoom, S. F., Blase, K., Fixsen, D. L., Van Dyke, M., & Bailey, F. W. (2010). Implementing Evidence-Based Programs in the Real World: Lessons Learned from Model Program Developers and Purveyors. Chapel Hill, NC: National Implementation Research Network, FPG Child Development Institute, UNC.
- Olds, D. L., Hill, P. L., O'Brien, R., Racine, D., & Moritz, P. (2003). Taking preventive intervention to scale: The nurse-family partnership. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 10, 278-290.
- Panzano, P. C., & Roth, D. (2006). The decision to adopt evidence-based and other innovative mental health practices: Risky business? *Psychiatric Services*, 57(8), 1153-1161.
- Panzano, P. C., Seffrin, B., Chaney-Jones, S., Roth, D., Crane-Ross, D., Massatti, R., et al. (2004). The innovation diffusion and adoption research project (IDARP). In D. Roth & W. Lutz (Eds.), *New research in mental health* (Vol. 16). Columbus, OH: The Ohio Department of Mental Health Office of Program Evaluation and Research.
- Rhim, L. M., Kowal, J. M., Hassel, B. C., & Hassel, E. A. (2007). *School turnarounds: A review of the cross-sector evidence on dramatic organizational improvement*. Lincoln, IL: Public Impact, Academic Development Institute.
- Schoenwald, S. K., Sheidow, A. J., & Letourneau, E. J. (2004). Toward Effective Quality Assurance in Evidence-Based Practice: Links Between Expert Consultation, Therapist Performance assessment, and Child Outcomes. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 33(1), 94-104.
- Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, 6, 445-488.

APPENDIX A: Behavioral Health Example

The following example demonstrates how the Implementation Drivers: Assessing Best Practices can be used. The data are from Terje Ogden and colleagues at the Atferdssenteret - Norsk senter for studier av problematferd og innovativ praksis - Universitet i Oslo (The Norwegian Center for Child Behavioral Development, University of Oslo).

Terje Ogden, Gunnar Bjørnebekk, John Kjøbli, Joshua Patras, Terje Christiansen, Knut Taraldsen, Nina Tollefsen (2012). Measurement of implementation components ten years after a nationwide introduction of empirically supported programs – a pilot study.

Implementation Science 2012, **7**:49

(access the article at <http://www.implementationscience.com/content/pdf/1748-5908-7-49.pdf>)

Ogden et al. collected data to establish the reliability and validity of the Initial Implementation items. Ogden et al. interviewed 218 practitioners, supervisors, and managers associated with two well-established evidence-based programs in Norway. The Cronbach alphas obtained in their study were: selection, 0.89; training, 0.91; coaching, 0.79; performance assessments, 0.89; decision support data systems, 0.84; facilitative administration, 0.82; systems intervention, 0.82; and leadership, 0.88.


It also was fascinating to see the Purveyor Profiles that emerged. As shown in the Figure below, the implementation supports provided by the Purveyor group for evidence-based program #1 were scored fairly high for Training and Supervision/Coaching, Systems Interventions, and Climate. See the Full Implementation Assessment for an explanation of the implementation climate items.

Scoring values:


0 = Not in place

1 = Partially in place

2 = Fully in place



The respondents rating Purveyor group for evidence-based programs #2 scored them fairly high across all implementation supports, although Decision Support Data Systems and Facilitative Administration/ Management could be improved a bit.




The discrimination between two highly regarded Purveyor groups provides further encouragement about the usefulness of the items for assessing the presence and strength of implementation components in complex human service environments.

APPENDIX B: Education Example

SUMMARY FOR THREE COMMUNITIES

Our colleagues in Oregon, Marick Tedesco and Kimberly Ingram, collected data from three school districts attempting to implement academic (mostly literacy and/or response to intervention) innovations along with innovations intended to improve behavior of students (school-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Support). The information was collected individually via a web-based survey. The individuals were those involved in directing and managing the innovations in academics and behavior.

The respondents generally were familiar with the NIRN Active Implementation Framework.



However, the respondents were not familiar with the items listed below prior to completing the survey.

Note that the same respondents, working with the same schools in the same districts, scored the implementation supports differently for academic innovations and behavior innovations. This is confirmation of the literature that emphasizes that implementation within an organization is specific to each innovation and should not be considered to be a “characteristic” of the organization itself. For example, the same organization might be in the Full Implementation Stage with regard to one innovation and in the Exploration Stage for another innovation. Thus, one would expect different levels of implementation supports to be in place for each.

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Recruitment and Selection of Staff

To what extent are best practices being used?	Academics			Behavior			Notes:
	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially in Place</i>	<i>Not in Place</i>	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially in Place</i>	<i>Not in Place</i>	
Accountability for developing recruitment and selection processes and criteria is clear (e.g. lead person designated and supported)	0	9	9	5	9	4	
Job description clarity re: accountability and expectations	0	7	11	3	8	7	
Pre-Requisites are related to “new practices” and expectations (e.g. basic group management skills)	0	7	11	0	12	5	1NR
Interactive Interview Process:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behavioral vignettes and Behavior Rehearsals 	0	7	11	1	6	11	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of ability to accept feedback 	0	0	18	0	5	12	1NR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of ability to change own behavior 	0	1	17	0	5	12	1NR
Interviewers who understand the skills and abilities needed and can	1	11	6	2	12	4	

assess applicants accurately.							
Feed forward of interview data to training staff & administrators & coaches (integration)	0	1	16	0	4	13	2NR
Feedback from exit interviews, training data, turnover data, opinions of administrators & coaches, and staff evaluation data to evaluate effectiveness of this Driver	0	2	15	0	4	13	2NR
Best Practice Scores - Percent of Recruitment and Selection Items in each column (9 ITEMS X 18 RESPONDENTS = 162 = DENOMINATOR)	1/162 = <u>1%</u>	45/162 = <u>28%</u>	114/162 = <u>70%</u>	11/162 = <u>7%</u>	65/162 = <u>40%</u>	81/162 = <u>50%</u>	7/162 = <u>4%</u>

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Training

To what extent are best practices being used?	Academics			Behavior			Notes:
	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially in Place</i>	<i>Not in Place</i>	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially in Place</i>	<i>Not in Place</i>	
Accountability for delivery and quality monitoring of training is clear (e.g. lead person designated and supported)	1	9	8	6	8	4	
Timely (criteria: Training occurs before the person attempts to or is required to use the new program or practice)	1	11	6	3	10	5	
Theory grounded (adult learning principles used)	1	7	10	6	5	7	
Skill-based							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behavior Rehearsals vs. Role Plays 	0	3	15	1	5	12	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualified Rehearsal Leaders who are Content Experts 	1	9	8	5	7	6	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practice to Criteria 	0	7	11	1	11	6	

Feed Forward of pre/post data to Coaches/Supervisors	0	8	10	3	8	7	1NR
Feedback of pre/post data to Selection and Recruitment	0	3	14	0	5	12	1NR
Outcome data collected and analyzed (pre and post testing) of knowledge and/or skills	1	7	10	4	9	5	
Trainers have been trained and coached	2	9	7	8	7	3	
Performance assessment measures collected and analyzed related to training (e.g. schedule, content, processes, qualification of trainers)	0	5	13	5	5	8	
Best Practice Scores - Percent of Recruitment and Selection Items in each column (11 ITEMS X 18 RESPONDENTS = 198 = DENOMINATOR)	7/198 = <u>3%</u>	78/198 = <u>39%</u>	112/198 = <u>57%</u>	42/198 = <u>21%</u>	80/198 = <u>40%</u>	75/198= <u>38%</u>	2/198= <u>1%</u>

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Supervision and Coaching

To what extent are best practices being used?	Academics			Behavior			Notes:
	In Place	Partially in Place	Not in Place	In Place	Partially in Place	Not in Place	
Accountability for development and monitoring of quality and timeliness of coaching services is clear (e.g. lead person designated and supported)	0	8	9	6	8	4	1NR
Written Coaching Service Delivery Plan	0	4	13	2	6	9	2NR
Uses multiple sources of information for feedback	1	9	8	4	8	6	
Direct observation of implementation (in person, audio, video)	0	8	9	1	11	6	1NR
Coaching data reviewed and informs improvements of other Drivers	0	8	8	0	5	12	3NR
Accountability structure and processes for Coaches							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adherence to Coaching Service Delivery Plan is regularly 	1	1	15	2	3	12	2NR

reviewed							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple sources of information used for feedback to coaches 	1	3	12	2	4	12	2NR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfaction surveys from those being coached 	1	3	12	3	3	11	3NR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observations of expert/master coach 	1	2	13	1	5	10	4NR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance assessment measures of those being coached as key coaching outcome 	0	0	17	0	4	12	3NR
Best Practice Scores - Percent of Supervision/Coaching Items in each column (10 ITEMS X 18 RESPONDENTS = 180 = DENOMINATOR)	5/180 = <u>3%</u>	46/180 = <u>26%</u>	116/180 = <u>64%</u>	21/180 = <u>12%</u>	57/180 = <u>32%</u>	94/180 = <u>52%</u>	21/180 = <u>12%</u>

COMPETENCY DRIVER - Performance Assessment - Performance assessment

To what extent are best practices being used?	Academics			Behavior			Notes:
	In	Partially	Not in	In Place	Partially	Not in	

	<i>Place</i>	<i>in Place</i>	<i>Place</i>		<i>in Place</i>	<i>Place</i>	
Accountability for performance assessment measurement and reporting system is clear (e.g. lead person designated and supported)	0	6	11	3	6	8	2NR
Transparent Processes – Proactive staff orientation to the process and procedures	0	9	8	5	10	3	1NR
Performance assessment measures are correlated with outcomes; are available on a regular basis and used for decision-making	0	5	12	2	8	8	1NR
Performance assessment measurement and reporting system is practical and efficient	0	5	12	2	7	9	1NR
Use of Appropriate Data Sources (e.g. competency requires observation)	0	10	7	5	7	5	2NR
Positive recognition processes in place for participation	0	6	11	2	9	7	1NR
Performance assessment data over time informs modifications to implementation drivers (e.g. how can Selection,	0	1	16	0	8	10	1NR

Training, and Coaching better support high performance assessment)							
Best Practice Scores - Average Percent of Performance Assessment/Performance assessment Items in each column (7 ITEMS X 18 RESPONDENTS = 126 = DENOMINATOR)	0/126= <u>0%</u>	42/126= <u>33%</u>	77/126= <u>61%</u>	19/126= <u>15%</u>	55/126= <u>43%</u>	50/126= <u>40%</u>	9/126= <u>7%</u>

ORGANIZATION DRIVER - Decision Support Data Systems

To what extent are best practices being used?	<i>Academics</i>			<i>Behavior</i>			Notes:
	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially in Place</i>	<i>Not in Place</i>	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially in Place</i>	<i>Not in Place</i>	
Accountability for measurement and reporting system is clear (e.g. lead person designated and supported)	0	9	9	4	9	5	
Includes intermediate and longer-term outcome measures	0	4	12	3	6	9	2NR
Includes process measures (performance assessment)	0	1	17	4	4	10	
Measures are “socially important” (e.g. health and human service achievement, agency safety)	1	7	10	6	5	7	
Data are:							
Reliable (standardized protocols, trained data gatherers)	1	9	8	6	7	5	
Reported frequently (e.g. weekly, quarterly)	1	12	5	5	12	1	
Built into practice routines	0	10	8	5	9	4	

Collected at and available to actionable units (e.g. grade level, practice setting, individual "unit")	0	15	3	6	11	1	
Widely shared with building and community personnel	0	12	6	5	9	4	
Shared with family members and community	1	6	10	0	9	8	2NR
Used to make decisions (e.g. training needed, coaching improvements)	1	8	8	3	12	3	1NR
Best Practice Scores - Average Percent of Decision Support Data System Items in each column (11 ITEMS X 18 RESPONDENTS = 198 = DENOMINATOR)	5/198= <u>3%</u>	93/198= <u>47%</u>	94/198= <u>47%</u>	47/198 = <u>24%</u>	93/198 = <u>47%</u>	57/198= <u>29%</u>	5/198= <u>3%</u>

ORGANIZATION DRIVER - Facilitative Administrative Supports

To what extent are best practices being used?	Academics			Behavior			Notes:
	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially in Place</i>	<i>Not in Place</i>	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially in Place</i>	<i>Not in Place</i>	
A Building/Community Leadership and Implementation Team is formed	3	10	4	10	7	1	1NR
The Building/Community Leadership and Implementation Team has Terms of Reference that include communication protocols to provide feedback to the next level “up” and describes from whom feedback is received (PEP-PIP protocol)	0	5	13	0	6	12	
The Team uses feedback and data to improve Implementation Drivers	1	6	11	2	9	7	
Policies and procedures are developed and revised to support the new ways of work	0	5	13	2	6	10	
Solicits and analyzes feedback from staff	0	3	15	2	9	7	
Solicits and analyzes feedback from “stakeholders”	1	2	15	2	6	10	

Reduces internal administrative barriers to quality service and high performance assessment implementation	0	3	13	0	8	9	3NR
Best Practice Scores - Average Percent of Facilitative Administration Items in each column (7 ITEMS X 18 RESPONDENTS = 126 = DENOMINATOR)	5/126= <u>4%</u>	34/126= <u>27%</u>	84/126= <u>67%</u>	18/126= <u>14%</u>	51/126= <u>40%</u>	56/126= <u>44%</u>	5/126= <u>4%</u>

ORGANIZATION DRIVER - Systems Intervention

To what extent are best practices being used?	<i>Academics</i>			<i>Behavior</i>			Notes:
	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially in Place</i>	<i>Not in Place</i>	<i>In Place</i>	<i>Partially in Place</i>	<i>Not in Place</i>	
Building Leadership and Implementation is formed and supported by the community	3	12	2	8	8	2	1NR
Leadership matches level needed to intervene	0	4	13	2	9	7	1NR
Engages and nurtures multiple “champions” and “opinion leaders”	0	5	13	2	9	7	
Objectively documents barriers and reports barriers to next level “up”	0	9	9	3	9	6	
Makes constructive recommendations to next level “up” to resolve barriers	0	10	8	4	8	6	
Develops formal processes to establish and use PEP – PIP cycles (e.g. linking communication protocols to give and receive feedback from the next level “down” and “up”)	0	1	16	0	3	15	1NR
Creates optimism and	1	10	7	6	8	4	

hope by communicating successes							
Average Percent of Systems Intervention Items in each column (7 ITEMS X 18 RESPONDENTS = 126 = DENOMINATOR)	4/126= <u>3%</u>	51/126 = <u>40%</u>	68/126= <u>54%</u>	25/126= <u>20%</u>	54/126= <u>43%</u>	47/126= <u>37%</u>	3/126= <u>2%</u>

LEADERSHIP DRIVER

To what extent are best practices being used?	Academics			Behavior			Notes:
	In Place	Partially in Place	Not in Place	In Place	Partially in Place	Not in Place	
Technical Leadership							
Leaders within the organization have <u>provided specific guidance</u> on technical issues where there was sufficient clarity about what needed to be done.	1	2	13	3	3	10	4NR
Leaders within the organization have been very <u>good at giving reasons</u> for changes in policies, procedures, or staffing.	2	7	7	6	6	5	3NR
Leaders within the organization have been <u>actively engaged in resolving any and all issues</u> that got in the way of using the innovation effectively.	1	10	6	5	8	4	2NR
Leaders within the organization have been very good at <u>focusing on the issues that really matter</u> at the practice level.	1	10	6	4	9	4	2NR

Leaders within the organization have been <u>fair, respectful, considerate, and inclusive</u> in their dealings with others.	4	11	2	7	9	1	2NR
Adaptive Leadership							
Leaders within the organization continually have looked for ways to <u>align practices with the overall mission, values, and philosophy</u> of the organization.	3	10	4	3	11	3	2NR
Leaders within the organization have <u>convened groups and worked to build consensus</u> when faced with issues on which there was little agreement about how to proceed.	2	6	9	5	7	5	2NR
Leaders within the organization have established <u>clear and frequent communication channels</u> to provide information to practitioners and to hear about their successes and concerns.	0	7	10	0	9	8	2NR

Leaders within the organization have <u>actively and routinely sought feedback from practitioners and others</u> regarding supports for effective use of the innovation.	0	9	8	1	11	5	2NR
Leaders within the organization <u>have been actively involved</u> in such things as conducting employment interviews, participating in practitioner training, conducting performance assessments of individual practitioners, and creating more and better organization-level assessments to inform decision making.	0	8	9	2	9	6	2NR
Average Percent of Leadership Items in each column (10 ITEMS X 18 RESPONDENTS = 180 = DENOMINATOR)	14/180= <u>8%</u>	80/180= <u>44%</u>	74/180= <u>41%</u>	36/180= <u>20%</u>	82/180= <u>46%</u>	51/180= <u>28%</u>	23/180= <u>13%</u>